CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	21 Construction, Inc. Scoria Testing
Proposed Implementation Date:	Fall 2023
Proponent:	21 Construction, Inc.
Location:	T27N-R57E-Sec 16
County:	Roosevelt
Trust:	Common Schools

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

21 Construction, Inc. henceforth referred to as the proponent, has applied for a scoria test permit on Montana State Trust Lands on the above-referenced tract in Roosevelt County. The proponent would utilize a backhoe to dig holes to determine the soil profile and underlying resource.

If approved, the proponent would be issued a test permit to determine the scoria resource contained within the above-referenced tract. Scoria and associated fines would be excavated from the ground and sub-surface. Topsoil would be saved, and the disturbance created would be reclaimed immediately upon completion of logging the test pit.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

The proponent has submitted a permit to test for aggregate to the DNRC to explore scoria resources. The DNRC Glasgow Unit has been notified.
There is one surface lease on the above-referenced tract, Ag & Grazing lease #744 by Diamond Ranch Cattle who has been notified of the application. The proponent would be responsible for contacting the Lessee prior to commencing any activity on the tract.

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

To test for Scoria on Montana State Trust Lands the operator must obtain and keep current the following permits:

- Permit to Test for Aggregate – Montana DNRC – Trust Lands Management Division (MMB)

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

No Action Alternative: The permit to test for scoria would be denied and the proponent would not be authorized to test for scoria on Montana State Trust Lands.

Action Alternative: The permit to test for scoria would be approved and the proponent would be authorized to dig scoria test holes from the proposed test site on Montana State Trust Lands.

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO THE PHYSICAL AND HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

The impacts analysis identifies and evaluates direct, secondary, and cumulative impacts.

• Direct impacts: impacts that occur at the same time and place as the action that causes the impact

• Secondary impacts: further impacts to the human environment that may be stimulated, or induced by, or otherwise result from a direct impact of the action.

• Cumulative impacts: collective impacts on the human environment of the proposed action when considered in conjunction with other past and present actions related to the proposed action by location or generic type. Related future actions must also be considered when these actions are under concurrent consideration by any state agency through pre-impact statement studies, separate impact study evaluation, or permit processing procedures.

Where impacts are expected to occur, the impacts analysis estimates the duration and severity of the impact.

<u>The duration of an impact is quantified as follows:</u>
• **Short-term**: impacts that would not last longer than the proposed operation of the site, including reclamation of the site.
• **Long-term**: impacts that would remain or occur following reclamation of the proposed site.

<u>The severity of an impact is measured using the following:</u>
• **No impact**: There would be no change from current conditions.
• **Negligible**: An adverse or beneficial effect would occur but would be at the lowest levels of detection.
• **Minor**: The effect would be noticeable but would be relatively small and would not affect the function or integrity of the resource.
• **Moderate**: The effect would be easily identifiable and would change the function or integrity of the resource.
• **Major**: The effect would alter the resource

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
• *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.* • *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.* • *Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:
Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

Current conditions

Geology: The Geology of the site consists of Fort Union Formation, Tongue River Member. It is described as Yellowish orange sandstone, sandy and silty carbonaceous shale, and coal. Alluvial plain.

Soils: According to the USDA's Web Soil Survey, the project area consists of two soil types.

1. Cabba-Cambert-Cherry Silt Loams 8 to 15 percent slopes
2. Cabba-Cambert-Cherry Silt Loams 15 to 45 percent slopes

These soils exhibit the following qualities. The primary soil factors to consider for gravel testing activities are soil erodibility and soil restoration potential. Soil erodibility is a factor that determines the soils risk to erode from stresses such as weather and machinery travel. Soil restoration is the potential for restoration to the original state. This is a good metric of how the soil will react upon reclamation.

- *Soil compactibilty risk* – These soils exhibit a medium compactibility risk.
- *Erosion Hazard* – These soils exhibit a severe erosion hazard.
- *Soil restoration potential* – These soils exhibit a high potential for soil restoration.
- *Soil rutting hazard* –These soils exhibit moderate to severe potential to soil rutting.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The selection of the no action alternative would not be expected to have any impact to the geology and soil quality, stability and moisture.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: The proponent would strip and stockpile topsoil prior to continuing to dig to a depth able to determine the underlying resource. The removal of topsoil and any potential aggregate resource would be immediately reversed by replacing substrate back into the hole and spreading topsoil over the stripped area. Negligible, short-term impacts to geology and soil quality, stability and moisture would be expected from the selection of the action alternative.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No additional cumulative impacts would be expected to geology, soil quality, stability and moisture from the selection of the action alternative.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

Mitigations

The potential selection of action alternative would include the following stipulation in the permit to test for aggregate:

- Testing activities would be conducted when the ground is dry to reduce potential for rutting.
- Topsoil would be saved in a separate pile and disturbance would be reclaimed immediately upon completion of logging the test hole.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:
Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

Current Conditions

Surface Water: The project area contains coulees and outcrops with benches and plateaus. The elevation varies greatly dependent upon where one is within the project area. Overall the project area's surface water drains north until it enters an unnamed ephemeral drainage just north of the section 16 line. There is a small wetlands area approximately 1000 feet from the project area. Runoff from the project area would be expected to enter this wetlands area.

Ground Water: A search of the Montana Ground Water Information Center found there is one well within a one-half mile radius of the project area. The well does not have any log information available on the GWIC site.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to have any impacts to water quality, quantity and distribution.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: The proponent would dig scoria test holes to determine the resource present in the area. Ground water would not be expected to be encountered during testing based on the relative elevation of the proposed testing area, the depth of digging, and the inferred ground water table from surrounding surface water. If ground water is encountered during testing activities, some turbidity may occur from digging activities. No significant impacts would be expected to occur to the quality or quantity of the groundwater if it is intersected during testing activities. The proponent would be required to maintain at minimum a 50-foot setback from wetlands or other surface water. Due to the short-term nature and small disturbance areas, negligible short-term impacts would be expected to surface water quality or quantity from the selection of the action alternative.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No additional cumulative impacts to water quality, quantity and distribution would be expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

Mitigations

The potential selection of action alternative would include the following stipulation in the aggregate permit:

- A 50-foot setback from wetlands must be maintained during testing.

- All equipment utilized in testing must be inspected prior to testing to ensure it is not leaking fluids, spreading noxious weeds, or creating an undue fire hazard.

6. AIR QUALITY:
What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

Current Conditions

Currently the significant emission sources in the project area are fugitive dust from agricultural activities and vehicles travelling on adjacent county roads. The proponent also has an active scoria mine approximately ¼ mile north of the proposed testing area. This operation creates minor amounts of fugitive dust. Although intermittent and irregular, fire activity can have a significant impact on air quality in the project area.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative would not be expected to have impacts on air quality.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: An increase in airborne pollutants and particulates may occur during testing activities from vehicles, and other associated heavy equipment exhaust. An increase in dust particulates may occur due to testing operations and truck traffic. Short-term, minor impacts to air quality in the project area are expected. No long-term impacts to air quality are expected.
- Secondary Impacts: Fugitive dust and emissions may travel offsite to the surrounding area. Any particulate or pollutant would dissipate over distance. Secondary impacts are expected to be short-term and negligible.
- Cumulative Impacts: Minor amounts of additional dust beyond what is currently created by agriculture activities would be expected from the project area.
- Duration: Any Impacts would be expected to last duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:
What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

Current Conditions

The project area within section 16 is predominately lowland/prairie grasslands systems which contains the Great Plans Mixed Grass Prairie and Great Plains Sand Prairie.

An inventory of the Montana Natural Heritage Program's Species of Concern database was conducted for the project area. The search yielded no observed vegetative species of concern within the project area.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative would be expected to have no impact to vegetation cover, quantity and quality in the project area.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: Vegetation communities would be impacted in the testing area. The use of excavation equipment would strip the plant communities within the test hole footprint, and vegetation would die as a result. The typical test hole disturbance is approximately 400 sqft. The proponent would likely dig multiple test holes. Upon completion of the test holes, the proponent would be required to revegetate the disturbed areas as well as mitigating any invasive weed species.
- Secondary Impacts: With the removal of vegetative communities, disturbances may result in the propagation of noxious and invasive weeds. Per the stipulations of the permit the proponent would be responsible for the management and mitigation of invasive weeds within the testing area.
- Cumulative Impacts: The cumulative impacts to vegetation resulting from the selection of the action alternative would be expected to be negligible.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until full reclamation.

Mitigations

The potential selection of action alternative would include the following stipulation in the aggregate permit:

- The permittee will be required to re-seed the disturbed areas with an approved seed mixture by the DNRC – Glasgow Unit and monitor for noxious weeds.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:
Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

Current Conditions

The project area is a badlands breaks area consisting of highly varied topography in small areas. The coulees are filled with deciduous trees and uplands consist of native grasses and shrubs. The habitat provides forage for a variety of wildlife species including deer and antelope throughout the year. Species present within the project vicinity may also include raptors and other birds, various rodents, rabbits, foxes, coyotes, and reptiles.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative would not be expected to have impacts to terrestrial, avian, and aquatic life and habitats.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: The selection of the action alternative would create a temporary disruption to general wildlife throughout the duration of the testing activities. Similar habitat and forage are

adjacent to the project area and could sustain the wildlife displaced during testing activities. Short-term, minor impacts are expected to wildlife habitat from the action alternative.

- Secondary Impacts: Negligible impacts would be expected, animals displaced from the project area would need to utilize surrounding lands while testing activities occur.
- Cumulative Impacts: Wildlife in the area have already been conditioned to the presence of heavy equipment and machinery. There is an oil well pad approximately 300 feet from the proposed project area along with the active scoria mine aforementioned in this analysis. The selection of the action alternative would not be expected to have significant additional impacts to wildlife in the area.
- Duration: Any impact would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:
Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

Current Conditions

A search was conducted using the Montana Natural Heritage Program database to identify species of concern in the project area. The search yielded two results for Golden Eagle and Whooping Crane.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to have impacts to unique endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: Short-term, negligible impacts to species of concern may occur. Minor amounts of rangeland including shrubs and grasses would be removed. Considerable forage and habitat similar to the composition of the project area would remain in adjacent areas. The adjacent lands have the capacity and suitability to support the listed species temporarily or fully during the term of the action alternative.
- Secondary Impacts: Negligible impacts would be expected, animals displaced from the project area would need to utilize surrounding lands while testing activities occur.
- Cumulative Impacts: The acreage from the current permit area and the proposed project area is not substantive enough to create significant cumulative impacts to wildlife. Short-term, negligible impacts are expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:
Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

Current Conditions

A Class III cultural and paleontological resources inventory was conducted of the area of potential effect on state land. Despite a detailed examination, no cultural or fossil resources were identified and no additional archaeological or paleontological investigative work is recommended. The proposed project will have *No Effect* to *Antiquities* as defined under the Montana State Antiquities Act. A formal report of findings has been prepared and is on file with the DNRC and the Montana State Historic Preservation Officer.

However, if previously unknown cultural or paleontological materials are identified during project related activities, all work will cease until a professional assessment of such resources can be made.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to have impacts to historical and archaeological sites.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: Because no cultural or paleontological resources were identified, proposed scoria testing activities will have *No Effect* to *Antiquities* as defined under the Montana State Antiquities Act. If cultural or paleontological resources are identified during testing operations, all work will cease until a professional assessment of such resources can be made.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

Mitigations

The potential selection of action alternative would include the following stipulation in the aggregate permit:

- If any cultural or paleontological resources are encountered during mining, all operations must stop and the proponent shall contact DNRC.

11. AESTHETICS:
Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

Current Conditions

The proposed testing area consists of badlands or breaks like topography in which the coulees contain deciduous vegetation, and the upland areas contain native grasses. The natural topography of the project area contains barriers that shield areas from the surrounding areas viewsheds and noise profiles.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to impact aesthetics.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: An increase in noise from trucks and heavy equipment may be heard adjacent to the project area. From adjacent roads, and public spaces the testing may be visible. Upon reclamation, the site will be returned to a landscape consistent with the surroundings. Impacts to aesthetics are expected to be short-term and minor.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative impacts in the form of added noise and visual disturbance would be expected to be negligible and short-term.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:
Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

Current Conditions

The composition of land, water and air is described within other sections of this document. Energy sources that would be required by the project are abundant in the area.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to have impacts to the demands of environmental resources of land, water, air or energy.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: The proposed project would create individual test holes within a larger area of approximately 50 acres. The overall disturbance created within the project area would be expected to have minor and short-term impacts on the environmental resources of the land. The expected impacts to water and air were identified earlier in this document. Energy resources in the area are abundant and any impact to energy resources would be expected to be negligible.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:
List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

Current Conditions

The tract currently has 3 agreements on it. A grazing lease is held by Diamond Ranch Cattle, LLC, an outfitting license is held by Montana River Ranch, and a and oil and gas lease is held by Kraken Oil and Gas, LLC.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to have impacts to other environmental documents or projects pertinent to the area.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: The grazing lessee would realize a short-term negligible loss in available acreage held under their lease. Upon reclamation the impacted areas would return to native rangeland. The proposed project would have a temporary, negligible impact to the surface lease agreement. Any future development in the area would likely be restricted to utility or mineral development.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: Negligible cumulative impacts expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.*
- *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.*
- *Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:
Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

Current Conditions

The current conditions of the site pose no risk to human health or safety.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to have any impact to human health or safety.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: The proposed action is expected to have no impacts to human health or safety, other than those typically associated with scoria testing employees. The site is in a rural area away from residences.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts would be expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:
Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

Current Conditions

The testing area is in a rural area where agriculture and oil and gas activity are the most prominent industries.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative would not be expected to have any impact to industrial, commercial, and agriculture activities and production.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: Scoria testing would not be expected to have any significant impacts upon the industrial, commercial, or agriculture activities.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts would be expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts would be expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:
Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

Current Conditions

The closest town and employment center is Culbertson, Montana.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to impact the quantity and distribution of employment.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: No direct impacts are expected to quantity and distribution of employment.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts could be expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:
Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

Current Conditions

Trust land is exempt from local property tax. Operators and lessees conducting business on Trust Lands must pay business taxes.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to have any impact on local and state tax bases or tax revenues.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: No direct impacts to local and state tax base and tax revenue is expected from the selection of the action alternative.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:
Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services.

Current Conditions

The testing area is in a very rural portion of Roosevelt County where the traffic is limited to local ranchers, oil and gas workers and employees of the proponent.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to have any impact on the demand for government services.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: During testing activities an increase in construction-related traffic may occur. The action alternative would have short-term and negligible impacts to traffic patterns.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until full reclamation.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:
List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

Current Conditions

There are no known environmental plans or goals for this tract or in the project vicinity.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to have any impact on locally adopted environmental plans or goals.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: No impacts expected, there are no known zoning or management plans.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:
Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

Current Conditions

This site is not designated as wilderness, nor does it provide access to wilderness. Montana State Trust Lands are accessible for public use by purchasing the necessary a conservation license through the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to have any impact on the access to and quality of recreational and wilderness activities.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: The site is landlocked and not accessible by county road. The public recreation on this tract is expected to be very limited to none at all.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:
Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

Current conditions

The closest population center to the project is Culbertson, MT.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to impact the density and distribution of population and housing.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: No direct impacts expected.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until full reclamation

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:
Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Current conditions

The closest known native and traditional lifestyles are on the Fort Peck Reservation, which is approximately 15 miles west of the project area.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to impact social structures, native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: No direct impacts are expected to native or traditional lifestyles.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.
- Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:
How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

Current Conditions

There are no known unique qualities of the area.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative is not expected to impact cultural uniqueness or diversity.

Action Alternative:

- Direct Impacts: No direct impacts are expected to unique qualities of the area.
- Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.
- Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.
- Duration: any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the permit, until final reclamation

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:
Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

The return to the trust would be a one-time application fee of $25.00 and the testing activities should not impede the existing utilization of State Lease No.744.

Upon reclamation, vegetation will be reestablished, and the area returned to grazing and agricultural ground.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Zack Winfield	Date: 8/14/23
	Title: Petroleum Engineer	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Action Alternative is selected, and complying with the mitigation stipulations listed below should result in no significant impacts.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

I conclude all identified potential impacts will be mitigated by utilizing the stipulations listed below and no significant impacts will occur because of implementing the selected alternative.

- Testing activities would be conducted when the ground is dry to reduce potential for rutting.
- Topsoil would be saved in a separate pile and disturbance would be reclaimed immediately upon completion of logging the test hole.
- A 50-foot setback from wetlands must be maintained during testing.
- All equipment utilized in testing must be inspected prior to testing to ensure it is not leaking fluids, spreading noxious weeds, or creating an undue fire hazard.
- The permittee will be required to re-seed the disturbed areas with an approved seed mixture by the DNRC – Glasgow Unit and monitor for noxious weeds.
- If any cultural or paleontological resources are encountered during mining, all operations must stop and the proponent shall contact DNRC.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

☐ EIS ☐ More Detailed EA ☑ No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	**Name:**	Don Pyrah
	Title:	Glasgow Unit Manager
Signature:		**Date:** 8/15/2023